

1
2
3
4
5
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

8 * * *

9 MARVIN MOSBY, Case No. 2:16-cv-03028-JCM-CWH
10 v. Petitioner,
11 RENEE BAKER, et al.,
12 Respondents.
13

14 Petitioner Marvin Mosby, through the Federal Public Defender (FPD) has filed a
15 petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. His application to
16 proceed *in forma pauperis* shall be granted (ECF No. 6).

17 The FPD has moved to be appointed as counsel in this case (ECF No. 8). There
18 is no constitutional right to appointed counsel for a federal habeas corpus proceeding.
19 *Pennsylvania v. Finley*, 481 U.S. 551, 555 (1987); *Bonin v. Vasquez*, 999 F.2d 425, 428
20 (9th Cir.1993). The decision to appoint counsel is generally discretionary. *Chaney v.*
21 *Lewis*, 801 F.2d 1191, 1196 (9th Cir.1986), cert. denied, 481 U.S. 1023 (1987); *Bashor*
22 *v. Risley*, 730 F.2d 1228, 1234 (9th Cir.), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 838 (1984). However,
23 counsel must be appointed if the complexities of the case are such that denial of
24 counsel would amount to a denial of due process, and where the petitioner is a person
25 of such limited education as to be incapable of fairly presenting his claims. See
Chaney, 801 F.2d at 1196; see also *Hawkins v. Bennett*, 423 F.2d 948 (8th Cir.1970).

27 As the FPD explains in the motion for appointment of counsel, this petition is the
28 third that Mosby has pending before this court (ECF No. 8). He challenges three

1 separate habitual offender convictions that were entered within several months of each
2 other. This court has already appointed the FPD in the first and second of the three
3 cases on the bases that Mosby is serving a life term without the possibility of parole, he
4 suffers from health issues, and his access to legal materials may be restricted. Good
5 cause appearing, the motion to appoint the FPD as counsel in this case is granted.
6

7 The court has reviewed the petition pursuant to Habeas Rule 4, and it shall be
8 served on respondents.

9 **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that petitioner's application to proceed *in forma*
10 *pauperis* (ECF No. 6) is **GRANTED**.

11 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the Clerk shall **ELECTRONICALLY SERVE** the
12 petition (ECF No. 1) on the respondents.

13 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the Clerk shall add Adam Paul Laxalt, Nevada
14 Attorney General, as counsel for respondents.

15 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the motion to appoint the FPD as counsel for
16 petitioner (ECF No. 8) is **GRANTED**.

17 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that respondents shall file a response to the petition,
18 including potentially by motion to dismiss, within **ninety (90) days** of service of the
19 petition, with any requests for relief by petitioner by motion otherwise being subject to
20 the normal briefing schedule under the local rules. Any response filed shall comply with
21 the remaining provisions below, which are entered pursuant to Habeas Rule 5.

22 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that any procedural defenses raised by respondents
23 in this case shall be raised together in a single consolidated motion to dismiss. In other
24 words, the court does not wish to address any procedural defenses raised herein either
25 *in seriatum* fashion in multiple successive motions to dismiss or embedded in the
26 answer. Procedural defenses omitted from such motion to dismiss will be subject to
27 potential waiver. Respondents shall not file a response in this case that consolidates
28 their procedural defenses, if any, with their response on the merits, except pursuant to

1 28 U.S.C. § 2254(b)(2) as to any unexhausted claims clearly lacking merit. If
2 respondents do seek dismissal of unexhausted claims under § 2254(b)(2): (a) they shall
3 do so within the single motion to dismiss not in the answer; and (b) they shall
4 specifically direct their argument to the standard for dismissal under § 2254(b)(2) set
5 forth in *Cassett v. Stewart*, 406 F.3d 614, 623-24 (9th Cir. 2005). In short, no
6 procedural defenses, including exhaustion, shall be included with the merits in an
7 answer. All procedural defenses, including exhaustion, instead must be raised by
8 motion to dismiss.

9 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that, in any answer filed on the merits, respondents
10 shall specifically cite to and address the applicable state court written decision and state
11 court record materials, if any, regarding each claim within the response as to that claim.

12 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that petitioner shall have **forty-five (45) days** from
13 service of the answer, motion to dismiss, or other response to file a reply or opposition,
14 with any other requests for relief by respondents by motion otherwise being subject to
15 the normal briefing schedule under the local rules.

16 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that any additional state court record exhibits filed
17 herein by either petitioner or respondents shall be filed with a separate index of exhibits
18 identifying the exhibits by number. The CM/ECF attachments that are filed further shall
19 be identified by the number of the exhibit in the attachment. **Any further exhibits shall**
20 **continue sequentially from the exhibits petitioner has already filed** (see ECF Nos.
21 3-5).

1 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the parties SHALL SEND courtesy copies of all
2 exhibits in this case to the Clerk of Court, 400 S. Virginia St., Reno, NV, 89501, directed
3 to the attention of "Staff Attorney" on the outside of the mailing address label. Additionally,
4 in the future, all parties shall provide courtesy copies of any additional exhibits submitted
5 to the court in this case, in the manner described above.

6
7 DATED: April 12, 2017.

8
9 
10

11 JAMES C. MAHAN
12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28